

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/660,433	09/07/2000	Kip Van Steenburg	7175/65430	6205
759	08/22/2002			
Richard D. Conard Barnes & Thomburg 1313 Merchants Bank Building			EXAMINER	
			TRETTEL, MICHAEL	
	11 S Meridan Street Indianapolis, IN 46204		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
indianapond, in			3673	
			DATE MAILED: 08/22/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	P
Advisory Action	09/660,433	STEENBURG, KIP VAN	5
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Trettel	3673	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 08 August 2002 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appelexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applic 1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in	bed
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of this Adverse, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three most patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the d statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extension fee the final Office action; or (2) as set f	under forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I	below);		
<ul><li>(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifyir	ig the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	l be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amend	ment
5.⊠ The a)□ affidavit, b)□ exhibit, or c)⊠ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NOT place	the
<ol> <li>The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.</li> </ol>	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly	1
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disap	proved by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·	
10. Other:			
		Michael Trettel Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3673	

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303) 09/660,433

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: it has failed to persuade the examiner that recapture has been avoided. An analysis of old claim 1 vs. that of new claim 14 reveals that the applicant has removed limitations that were added during prosecution to secure an allowance. The limitations in question are drawn to the longitudinal axis of the apparatus-these were explicitly added during prosecution in order to make the claims allowable, by removing these limitations the claims are broader with respect to surrendered subject matter.